





| | REPURT DUCUM | ENTATION PAGE | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| NCLASSIFIED | PORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION | | ARKINGS | | A STORY | |
| CURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY | | 3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT | | | | |
| DURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY A CLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHE | A CLASSIFICATION COMMON A DINC SCHEDULE | | Approved for Public Release; Distribution | | | |
| | | Unlimited | | | | |
| FORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) SU Technical Report No. M752 | | S. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBERIS) | | | | |
| ME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION 66. OFFICE SYMBOL | | 74. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION | | | | |
| orida State University | (If applicable) | AFOSR/NM | | | | |
| DRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) | | 7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) | | | | |
| Department of Statistics Tallahassee, FL 32306-3033 | | Bldg. 410 Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332-6448 | | | | |
| B. NAME OF UNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION | 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL | 9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER AFOSR F49620-85-C-0007 | | | | |
| AFOSR | NM | | | | | |
| Bc. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) | | 10. SOURCE OF FUR | DING NOS. | | | |
| Bldg. 410 | _ | PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. | PROJECT NO. | TASK NO. | WORK UNIT | |
| Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332-644 | 8 | 6.1102F | 2304 | A5 | | |
| 11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) | | | <u> </u> | | | |
| Stationary Regenerative Sets | and Subordinat | ors | | | | |
| 12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) P.J. Fitzsi | mmons and Micha | el Taksar | | | | |
| Taubai na 1 | | | 14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) November, 1986 15. PAGE COUNT | | | |
| 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION | | <u>- L</u> | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 17. COSATI CODES | 18. SUBJECT TERMS (| Continue on reverse if ne | cessary and identi | ify by block numbe | r) | |
| FIELD GROUP SUB. GR. | , | • | | | | |
| | 4 | | | | | |
| 19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary as | nd identify by block numb | er) | | | | |
| In this paper we give a s set, based on the stationary process). We show that, in is a stationary regenerative set is σ -finite in general; finite expectation. | version of the a certain sense subset of R. | e associated su e, the closed r The distribut | bordinator ange of su ion of thi | (increasing the a Levy p s regenerat | ng Levy process rive ss have | |
| O. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRA | СТ | 21. ABSTRACT SECL | PRITY CLASSIFI | CATION | | |
| | | | | 1) | j | |

DD FORM 1473, 83 APR

Proschan and M. Hollander

EDITION OF 1 JAN 73 IS OBSOLETE.

UNCLASSIFIED

22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER X 1) 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL (Include Area Code) 767

767

(904) 644-3218 5005

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PA

AFOSR/NM

STATIONARY REGENERATIVE SETS

AND SUBORDINATORS

by AFOSR-TR- 87-1043

P.J. Fitzsimmons

Department of Mathematical Sciences The University of Akron Akron, OH 44325

and

Michael I. Taksar¹

Department of Statistics Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306-3033

FSU Technical Report No. M752 AFOSR Technical Report No. 86-204

November, 1986

¹Research supported in part by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Grant Number F49620-85-C-0007.

1980 AMS Subject Classification: 60D05 (primary), 60J25, 60J30.

Stationary Regenerative Sets and Subordinators

by

P. J. Fitzsimmons

and

Michael Taksar

<u>Abstract</u>

In this paper we give a simple construction of the general stationary regenerative set, based on the stationary version of the associated subordinator (increasing Levy process). We show that, in a certain sense, the closed range of such a Levy process is a stationary regenerative subset of R. The distribution of this regenerative set is σ -finite in general; it is finite iff the increments of the Levy process have finite expectation.

1980 AMS Subject Classification: 60D05 (primary) 60J25, 60J30.

1. Introduction

A regenerative set is a random subset of R with the property that any stopping time in the set splits the set into two independent pieces, the right hand piece (as viewed from the stopping time) having a distribution independent of the particular stopping time. Such sets arise naturally as the set of times when a strong Markov process visits a particular point in its state space. For background on regenerative sets the reader can consult [2], [5], [6], [8], [9], [10], [11], [13], [14].

It is known ([8], [10], [11]) that any regenerative subset of $[0,+\infty[$, defined on a probability space, can be realized as the closed range of an appropriate subordinator (an increasing process with stationary independent increments). This correspondence was extended to the case of stationary subsets of $\mathbb R$ by Taksar [13], and later by Maisonneuve [10]. Both of these authors confine themselves to the case where the underlying measure space is a probability space. This amounts to restricting attention to those regenerative sets whose associated subordinators have increments with finite expectation.

In recent years a theory of stationary Markov processes on σ -finite (typically infinite) underlying measure spaces has been developed. The fundamental paper in this regard is Kuznetsov [7]. See also [3]. With this theory in hand we can deal with the most general stationary regenerative set. We consider a stationary subordinator Y and its closed range M. Unfortunately the distribution of M is never σ -finite. But if T is an appropriate random time (say a passage time of Y), then the pair

(T,M) has a σ -finite law which factors as the product of Lebesgue measure and a second measure P. The measure P is the $(\sigma$ -finite) distribution of a regenerative set which is naturally associated with Y.

In the next section we set our notation and recall some basic facts about subordinators and regenerative sets. In section 3 we consider the range of a stationary subordinator, as discussed above. In a final section we use the result of section 3 to give a simple proof of the fact that if M is a stationary regenerative set, then -M has the same distribution as M.

2. Regenerative Sets and Subordinators

Our notation and the basic definition (2.1) are inspired by [10] and [2]. The definition of $r_{\rm t}$ below is slightly different from that of [10] and [2]; this change was suggested to us by Bernard Maisonneuve (private communication). See the note at the end of [2].

Let Ω° denote the class of closed subsets of R. For ter, we Ω° define

$$d_{t}(w) = \inf\{s > t: s \in w\}; r_{t}(w) = d_{t}(w) - t;$$

$$\tau_{\pm}(w^2) = c\ell\{s - t: s \in w^n\}t, +\infty[\} = c\ell((w^n - t)n]0, +\infty[).$$

Here $c\ell$ denotes closure and $\inf \phi = +\infty$. Set $\mathfrak{C} = \sigma\{r_s : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$, $\mathfrak{C} = \sigma\{r_s : s \le t\}$. Clearly $(d_t : t \in \mathbb{R})$ is an increasing cadlag process adapted to $(\mathfrak{C}_t^\circ : t \in \mathbb{R})$, and $d_t \ge t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$

A random set is a measurable mapping M from a measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) into $(\Omega^{\circ}, \mathcal{F}^{\circ})$. Associated to a random set M are several processes: $D_{t} = d_{t} \circ M$, $R_{t} = r_{t} \circ M$, $M_{t} = r_{t} \circ M$.

Let $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, P)$ be a σ -finite measure space and let $(\mathfrak{F}_{\mathsf{t}} : \mathsf{t} \in \mathbb{R})$ be a right continuous filtration in (Ω, \mathfrak{F}) . Let M be a random set defined on (Ω, \mathfrak{F}) .

- (2.1) <u>Definition</u>. $M = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{t}, M, P)$ is a regenerative set provided
 - i) (D_+) is adapted to (\mathcal{F}_+) ;

- ii) $P(D_+ = +\infty) = 0$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$;
- iii) $R_t(P) \equiv P(R_t \in \cdot)$ is a σ -finite measure on $[0, +\infty[$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$;
- iv) there is a probability measure P on (Ω°, \P°) such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

(2.2)
$$P(f(M_{D_{t}})|_{y_{t}}) = P^{\circ}(f), \forall f \in (y^{\circ})^{+}.$$

In this case P° is called the regeneration law of M.

- (2.3) <u>Remarks</u>. a) Hypothesis (2.1 ii) means that M is unbounded on the right, a.e. P. This hypothesis is made to simplify the exposition and could be dispensed with.
- b) Since $\sigma(R_t) \subset \mathcal{F}_t$, (2.1 iii) implies that P restricted to \mathcal{F}_t is a σ -finite measure. Thus the conditional expectation required in (2.1 iv) is well defined.

Let M° denote the identity map on Ω° . It is easy to check that $(\Omega^{\circ}, 9^{\circ}, 9^{\circ}_{t+}, M^{\circ}, P^{\circ})$ is a regenerative set (with regeneration law P°). In addition P° satisfies

(2.4)
$$P(0 \in M \subset [0, +\infty[) = 1.$$

It is well known that any such regeneration law P° arises as the distribution of the closed range of some <u>subordinator</u> (see [8, 10, 11]). That is, on some probability space there is defined a subordinator $X = (X_t: t \ge 0)$ (an increasing, right continuous R-valued process with stationary independent increments) such that the distribution of the random set $C(X_t - X_0: t \ge 0)$ is precisely

 P° . Note that because of (2.1 ii), $P^\circ(M^\circ)$ is unbounded) = 1; it follows that $X_t \uparrow +\infty$ as $t \uparrow +\infty$, almost surely. Let P^X denote the law of X under the condition $X_0 = x \ (x \in \mathbb{R})$. Clearly P^X is the same as the law of $(X_t + x: t \ge 0)$ under P^0 . Because X has stationary independent increments, the laws P^X (and so also the regeneration law P°) are completely determined by

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{e}^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{e}^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}} \mathbb{P}^{0}(\mathbf{e}^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{t}) = \exp(-\alpha \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{tg}(\alpha)), \ \alpha > 0,$$

where the Levy exponent g is given by

$$(2.6) g(\alpha) = \lambda \alpha + \int_{0}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-\alpha x}) \pi(dx).$$

Here $\lambda \ge 0$ is the <u>drift</u> of X, and π , the <u>Levy measure</u> of X, is a measure on $]0,+\infty[$ such that the right side of (2.6) is finite for all $\alpha > 0$. Let U(x,A) denote the potential kernel for X; namely

(2.7)
$$U(x,A) = \mathbb{P}^{X} \left(\int_{0}^{\infty} 1_{A}(X_{t}) dt \right).$$

Write U(A) for U(0,A); by spatial invariance $U(x,A) \approx U(A-x)$. Using (2.5) we have

(2.8)
$$\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha y} U(dy) = 1/g(\alpha), \quad \alpha > 0.$$

Now define a measure π on $[0,+\infty[$ by

(2.9)
$$\pi(A) = \lambda \epsilon_0(A) + \int_A \pi(]x, +\infty[)dx, A \in \mathcal{B}_{[0,+\infty[}.$$

One checks that $\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha x} \pi(dx) = g(\alpha)/\alpha.$ If follows from (2.8) that

(2.10)
$$\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha x} \pi(dx) \cdot \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha y} U(dy) = 1/\alpha, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

Inverting Laplace transforms in (2.10) we arrive at

$$\pi U(A) \equiv \int \pi(dx)U(x,A) = m(A \cap]0,+\infty[),$$

$$[0,+\infty[$$

where m denotes Lebesgue measure on R. Clearly π is a σ -finite measure. It is known (see e.g. [10]) that π is an invariant measure for the "residual life" process $(r_{t}:t\geq0)$ which under P° is a strong Markov process. This fact is also an easy consequence of the construction of the next section; see (3.5 iii). Note that by (2.10) we have

$$\pi[0,+\infty[=\lambda+\int_{0}^{\infty}x\pi(dx)].$$

On the other hand, by (2.5) and (2.6),

$$\mathbf{P}^{0}(\mathbf{X}_{t})/t = \lambda + \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathbf{x} \pi(d\mathbf{x}).$$

Thus $\pi[0,+\infty[$ < ∞ iff $\mathbb{P}^{0}(X_{t})$ < ∞ for all t>0.

3. Stationary Subordinators and Regenerative Sets

We shall say that a regenerative set M is <u>stationary</u> provided M - t \equiv {s-t: s \in M} has the same law as M, for each t \in R. More formally, M is stationary if its distribution (a measure on $(\Omega^{\circ}, \P^{\circ})$) is invariant under the family of transformations $\theta_{+}: W \to W^{\circ}$ -t, t \in R, $W \in \Omega^{\circ}$.

In view of the relationship noted in the last section between subordinators and regenerative subsets of $[0,+\infty[$, one might think that each stationary regenerative set could be obtained as the closed range of the appropriate stationary subordinator. Unfortunately the distribution of the range of a stationary subordinator is <u>never</u> a σ -finite measure: if it gives an event positive measure, then that event has infinite measure. This problem can be sidestepped by means of a trick; the complete story is contained in Theorem (3.5) below.

To begin, let P be the regeneration law of some regenerative set as in Definition (2.1). Let $X = (X_t: t \ge 0; P^X: x \in R)$ be the associated subordinator with Levy exponent g as in (2.6). Thus P is the law (on (Ω^0, \P^0)) of $c\ell(X_t - X_0: t \ge 0)$ under any of the laws P^X .

Note that the Lebesgue measure m on R is an invariant measure for X. The proposition to follow is therefore a special case of a theorem of Kuznetsov [7]. See also [3] for related matters. Let W denote the space of paths $w: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ which are increasing and right continuous. Let $Y_t(w) = w(t)$, $Y_t = \sigma(Y_s: s \in \mathbb{R})$, $Y_t = \sigma(Y_s: s \in \mathbb{R})$.

- (3.1) <u>Proposition</u> There is a unique σ -finite measure Q on (W, Ψ) under which $Y = (Y_t : t \in \mathbb{R})$ is a strong Markov process with one dimensional distributions all Lebesgue measure m, and with the same transition function as X. More precisely,
 - i) $Q(Y_t \in A) = m(A)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $A \in \mathfrak{B}$;
- (3.2) Remarks a) It is implicit in (3.1 ii) that Q restricted to $\P_{T+} \cap \{T \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is σ -finite.
- b) Q is stationary in the sense that $\sigma_{\mathsf{t}}(\mathsf{Q}) = \mathsf{Q}$, $\forall \mathsf{t} \in \mathbb{R}$, where $(\sigma_{\mathsf{t}}\mathsf{w})(\mathsf{s}) = \mathsf{w}(\mathsf{t}+\mathsf{s})$. Also, it is clear from (3.1 i) and (2.5) that Q is invariant under the spatial translations ϕ_{X} defined by $(\phi_{\mathsf{v}}\mathsf{w})(\mathsf{t}) = \mathsf{w}(\mathsf{t}) \mathsf{x}$.

Let $M = M(w) = c\ell\{Y_t(w): t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ denote the closed range of Y. Clearly M is a random set on (W, Y). We leave it to the reader to check that, a.e. Q,

(3.3)
$$\lim_{t\to-\infty} Y_t = -\lim_{t\to+\infty} Y_t = -\infty.$$

Thus M is almost surely unbounded on both sides. Note that $M(\varphi_{\mathbf{x}} w) = \theta_{\mathbf{x}}(M(w)), \quad \text{where} \quad \theta_{\mathbf{x}} w = w - x \quad \text{as before}.$

Let us say that a \P -measurable random time $T:W\to R\cup\{+\infty,-\infty\}$ is an <u>intrinsic time</u> if $Q(T\notin R)=0$ and if

$$t + T(\sigma_t w) = T(w), \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \forall w \in W.$$

For example, the passage times L_s defined by

$$L_s = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}: Y_t > s\}$$

are intrinsic times. Note that $L_s(\phi_x w) = L_{s+x}(w)$.

(3.5) Theorem. There is a unique σ -finite measure P on $(\Omega^{\circ}, 9^{\circ})$ such that

(3.6)
$$Q(f(T,M)) = (m \otimes P)(f), f \in (3 \otimes 3)^+,$$

for any intrinsic time T. Moreover

- i) $(\hat{n}, \hat{s}, \hat{s}_{t+}, \hat{M}, P)$ is a regenerative set with regeneration law \hat{P} ;
 - ii) P is stationary; i.e., $\theta_{t}(P) = P$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$.
- iii) $P(r_t \in A) = \pi(A)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $A \in \mathcal{B}_{[0,+\infty[}$, where π is defined by (2.9).

From (3.6) we see that $Q(M \in A) = (+\infty) \cdot P(A)$ for any $A \in \mathfrak{F}$, justifying the remark in the second paragraph of this section.

The proof of (3.5) requires two lemmas. The first of these is a special case of a "switching identity" of Neveu [12]. We give a short proof for completeness.

(3.7) Lemma. Let S and T be intrinsic times, and let $A \in \mathcal{G}^+$ be (σ_t) -invariant. Let \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P} be positive Borel functions on \mathbb{R} with $0 < m(\mathcal{P}) = m(\mathcal{P}) < \infty$. Then

$$Q(\Upsilon(S)A) = Q(\Upsilon(T)A)$$
.

Proof. We use Fubini to compute:

$$m(\mathcal{P})Q(\mathcal{P}(S)A) = Q(\mathcal{P}(S) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{P}(T+u)du \cdot A)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} Q(\mathcal{P}(S \circ \sigma_{u}) \mathcal{P}(T \circ \sigma_{u}+u) A \circ \sigma_{u}) du$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} Q(\mathcal{P}(S-u) \mathcal{P}(T)A) du$$

$$= m(\mathcal{P})Q(\mathcal{P}(T)A).$$

We have used the fact that $\sigma_{ij}(Q) = Q$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

(3.8) Lemma. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

(3.9)
$$Q(f(L_s, Y_{L_s} - s)) = (m \cdot \pi)(f), f \in (\Re \cdot \Re_{[0, +\infty[)})^+.$$

 $\begin{array}{lll} \underline{Proof}. & \text{Since } (L_{_{\mathbf{S}}},Y_{L_{_{\mathbf{S}}}}-s))=(L_{_{\mathbf{0}}},Y_{L_{_{\mathbf{0}}}})^{\circ}\varphi_{_{\mathbf{S}}} & \text{and since } \varphi_{_{\mathbf{S}}}(Q)=Q, \\ \\ \text{it suffices to consider the case } s=0. & \text{The reader can check} \\ \\ \text{that } Q(L_{_{\mathbf{0}}}=0)=0=Q(Y_{_{\mathbf{0}}}=0). & \text{Thus, since } Y & \text{is increasing,} \\ \end{array}$

$$Q(g(Y_0); L_0 < 0) = Q(g(Y_0); L_0 \le 0)$$

= $Q(g(Y_0); Y_0 > 0)$

$$= m(g1_{]0,+\infty[}),$$

by (3.1 i). But $m(g1_{]0+\infty[}) = \pi U(g)$ by (2.11). By (2.4) and (5.3) of [3] formula (3.8) follows in case s = 0.

Proof of Theorem (3.5).

1. Let Q_T denote the measure on $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega^{\circ}$ defined by the left side of (3.6). Q_T is a countable sum of finite measures, since Q is σ -finite. If $f_t(s,w) \equiv f(t-s,w)$, then since $M^{\circ}\sigma_t = M$

$$Q_{T}(f_{t}) = Q(f(T-t,M))$$

$$= Q(f(T^{o}\sigma_{t},M^{o}\sigma_{t}))$$

$$= Q(f(T,M)) = Q_{T}(f).$$

Thus, Q_T is translation invariant in its first coordinate. By a result of Getoor [4], there is a unique measure P_T (a countable sum of finite measures) such that $Q_T = m \cdot P_T$. Since $M^{\circ}\sigma_t = M$, it follows from Lemma (3.7) that P_T does not depend on the particular intrinsic time T. Thus, setting $P = P_T$ for any such T, we have $Q_T = m \cdot P$, which is (3.6).

2. Recall that $\theta_t w = w - t$ for $w \in \Omega$. Since $M \circ \phi_t = \theta_t \circ M$, $L_{s+t} = L_s \circ \phi_t$, and $\phi_t(Q) = Q$, we have

$$\theta_{t}(P)(F) = Q(F^{\circ}M^{\circ}\phi_{t}; 0 < L_{0} \le 1)$$

=
$$Q(F \circ M \circ \phi_t; 0 < L_{-t} \circ \phi_t \le 1)$$

= $Q(F \circ M; 0 < L_{-t} \le 1)$
= $P(F)$,

where the first and last equalities follow from (3.6). Thus, P is stationary (i.e. (3.5 ii) holds).

- 3. Point iii) of (3.5) is an immediate consequence of (3.6) and Lemma (3.8), since $X_{L_0} = R_0 = r_0^{\circ}M$. In particular, $R_t(P)$ is σ -finite for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$.
- 4. To verify that $(\Omega^\circ, \P^\circ, \P^\circ_{t+}, M^\circ, P)$ satisfies Definition (2.1) it only remains to check (2.2). Because $\theta_t(P) = P$ it suffices to consider the case t = 0. Given $F \in \P^\circ_{0+}$ note that $F^\circ M \in \P^\circ_{L_0+}$. Also, $M_{D_0} = c\ell\{Y_t Y_{L_0} : t > L_0\}$. Since L_0 is a stopping time of (\P_{t+}) , the distribution of M_{D_0} conditional on \P_{L_0+} is the same as the P° distribution of $c\ell\{X_t : t \ge 0\}$ (by the strong Markov property (3.1 ii)). Since P° is the P^0 distribution of $c\ell\{X_t : t \ge 0\}$, (2.2) holds as required.

An Application

As an application of the construction of the last section we shall give a short proof of the distributional equality $M \stackrel{d}{=} -M$, whenever M is a stationary regenerative set.

Thus, let M be a stationary regenerative set with regeneration law P°. Let \tilde{P} be the distribution of M on (Ω°, s°) . We claim that, up to a constant multiple, \tilde{P} must be identical with the particular stationary regenerative set constructed in the last section, starting from P°. Indeed, the residual life process (r_t) , which under P° is a strong Markov process, is easily seen to be a finely recurrent process with a single recurrence class. By [1], the process (r_t) has a σ -finite invariant measure which is unique up to a constant multiple. But each of the laws $\pi = r_0(P)$ and $\tilde{\pi} = r_0(\tilde{P})$ is a σ -finite invariant measure for (r_t) . Thus π and $\tilde{\pi}$ are multiples of one another. It follows that P and \tilde{P} are multiples, as claimed.

(4.1) Theorem. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{t}, M, P)$ be a stationary regenerative set. Then for any $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $P(M \in A) = P(-M \in A)$. That is, $M \stackrel{d}{=} -M$.

<u>Proof.</u> By the discussion preceding the theorem, we may work with the canonical realization $(\Omega^\circ, \P^\circ, \P^\circ_{t+}, M^\circ, P)$. Moreover we can assume that P arises via Theorem (3.5). Thus let (Y_t) be the stationary subordinator, and M the closed range of Y, as in (3.5). Consider the process $\widetilde{Y}_t = -Y_{(-t)-}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly \widetilde{Y} is increasing and right continuous. We leave it to the reader to check that (\widetilde{Y}_t) under Q has the same distribution as (Y_t) under Q. Note that the closed range \widetilde{M} of \widetilde{Y} is just -M. Moreover, $\widetilde{L}_0 = \inf\{t: \widetilde{Y}_t > 0\}$ is an intrinsic time (of Y). Thus

$$P(A) = Q(O < L_O \le 1, M \in A)$$

$$= Q(0 < \widetilde{L}_{0} \le 1, \widetilde{M} \in A)$$

$$= Q(0 < \widetilde{L}_{0} \le 1, -M \in A)$$

$$= P(\widetilde{A}),$$

where $\widetilde{A} = \{w^\circ: \neg w^\circ \in A\}$. The identity $P(A) = P(\widetilde{A})$, $\forall A \in \mathfrak{F}^\circ$ is a formal version of the statement of the theorem, so we are done. \square

References

- Azema, J., Kaplan-Duflo, M., Revuz, D. (1967). Mesure invariante sur les classes récurrentes des processus de Markov. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete 8, 157-181.
- Fitzsimmons, P.J., Fristedt, B., Maisonneuve, B. (1985).
 Intersections and limits of regenerative sets. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete 70, 157-173.
- Fitzsimmons, P.J., Maisonneuve, B. (1986). Excessive measures and Markov processes with random birth and death. Prob. Th. Rel. Fields <u>72</u>, 319-336.
- 4. Getoor, R.K. (1986). Measures that are translation invariant in one coordinate. Preprint.
- 5. Hoffmann-Jorgensen, J. (1969). Markov sets. Math. Scand. 24, 145-166.
- 6. Krylov, N.V., Yushkevich, A.A. (1965). Markov random sets. Transl. Moscow Math. Soc. <u>13</u>, 127-153.
- 7. Kuznetsov, S.E. (1974). Construction of Markov processes with random times of birth and death. Theor. Prob. Appl. 18, 571-574.
- 8. Maisonneuve, B. (1971). Ensembles régénératifs, temps locaux et subordinateurs. Lecture Notes in Math <u>191</u>, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- 9. Maisonneuve, B. (1974). Systèmes Régénératifs. Astérisque 15, Société Mathématique de France.
- Maisonneuve, B. (1983). Ensembles régénératifs de la droite.
 Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete 63, 501-510.
- 11. Meyer, P.A. (1970). Ensembles régénératifs, d'aprés Hoffmann-Jorgensen. Lecture Notes in Math <u>124</u>, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- 12. Neveu, J. (1976). Sur les mesures de Palm de deux processus ponetuels stationnaires. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete 34, 199-203.
- 13. Taksar, M. (1980). Regenerative sets on real line. Lecture Notes in Math <u>784</u>, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- 14. Taksar, M. (1986). Stationary Markov sets. Preprint.

END DATE FILMED DEC. 1987